JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) Cand rev (1/15/13)

Case 3:16-cv-02925-EPLI Decument 1 Page 1 of 13

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil do	cket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAG		P.M.)		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS SVETLANA BLACKI		DEFENDANTS ORACLE AMERICA, INC.			
SVEILANA DLACKDURN			ORACLE AMERICA, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of (EX		County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O	San Mateo NLY)	
			NOTE:	IN LAND CONDEMNATION C THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF VED.
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A VELTON ZEGELMA) 525 W. Remington Dr, Sunnyvale CA 94087 (408) 505-7892			Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZ	ZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government	□ 3 Federal Question	(F	For Diversity Cases Only) PT	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen	n of This State	1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In T	•
2 U.S. Government Defendant	X 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	n of Another State	2 Incorporated and P of Business In A	•
			n or Subject of a sign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		TO:		D A NIZD KIDWOW	OTHER CT ATMEN
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans ☐ (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 365 Personal Inju 367 Health Care/ 367 Health Care/ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury 368 Asbestos Personal Injury 368 Asbestos Personal Injury 369 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 364 Augusta 365 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 363 Personal Injury 364 Augusta 371 Truth in Lenc Product Liability 380 Other Personal Injury 387 Property Dam Product Liability 388 Property Dam Product Liability 370 Other Personal Injury 389 Other Personal Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 361 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 363 Personal Injury 364 Other Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 365 Personal Injury 385 Property Dam Product Liability 370 Other Personal Injury 370 Other Personal Inju	General Part	RFEITURE/PENALTY Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	322 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 425 Executive 426 Executive 427 Executive 428 Executive 429 Exe	OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	noved from 3 Remanded from	∐4 Reinst	tated or □ 5 Trans	sferred from ∐ 6 Multidis	
Proceeding Stat	te Court Appellate Court	Reope		her District Litigatio	n
VI CAUGE OF	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you			tes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 U.S.C. §1391(c); 18 U.S.C. §1514A et s Brief description of cause: Sarbanes-Oxley Act; Dodd-Frank Wall Stre		-	ct	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	DF	MAND \$		if demanded in complaint: X Yes No
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSI (Place an "X" in One Box Onl	IGNMENT (Civil L.R. 3-2) (y) (x) S	SAN FRAN	CISCO/OAKLAN	D () SAN JOSE	() EUREKA

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - **(c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X' in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Northern Dis	trict of California
SVETLANA BLACKBURN, an individual, Plaintiff(s) v. ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation, Defendant(s)))))) Civil Action No.))))
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) ORACLE AMERICA, INC. 500 Oracle Parkway Redwood Shores, CA 94065	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an offic	ou (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ter or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. swer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of on must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

was re	This summons for (na. ceived by me on (date)	me of individual and title, if any)				
	_	d the summons on the indiv	vidual at <i>(place)</i>			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I left the summon					
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides ther					
on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last know				ess; or		
		nons on (name of individual)		, who is		
	designated by law to	accept service of process of	n behalf of (name of organization)			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because		; or		
	Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total	l of \$		
	I declare under penalt	y of perjury that this inforn	nation is true.			
ъ.						
Date:			Server's signature			
			Printed name and title			
			Server's address			

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Case 3:16-cv-02925-EDL Document 1 Filed 06/01/16 Page 5 of 13 Daniel Velton, Esq. (SBN 267890) VJ Chetty, Esq. (SBN 271778) VELTON ZEGELMAN P.C. 1 2 525 W. Remington Drive, Suite 106 3 Sunnyvale, CA 94087 Telephone: (408) 505-7892 4 Fax: (408) 228-1930 dvelton@vzfirm.com 5 vchetty@vzfirm.com 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SVETLANA BLACKBURN 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 Case No.: SVETLANA BLACKBURN, an individual, 12 **COMPLAINT FOR:** Plaintiff, 13 (1) Violation of Whistleblower Protections under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (18 V. 14 U.S.C. § 1514A et seq.); ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware 15 (2) Violation of Whistleblower corporation, **Protections under the Dodd-Frank** Wall Street Reform and Consumer 16 Protection Act (15 U.S.C. § 78u-6 et Defendants. 17 seq.); 18 (3) Retaliation under California Labor Code § 1102.5; 19 (4) Wrongful Termination in Violation of **Public Policy** 20 21 22 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** (UNLIMITED CIVIL) 23 24 25 26 27 28 1

Plaintiff SVETLANA BLACKBURN (hereinafter "BLACKBURN" or "Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself, demanding trial by jury of all issues joined herein, alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

////

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a resident of the County of San Mateo, California and was an employee of Defendants ORACLE AMERICA, INC. (hereinafter "Defendants" or "the company"). Defendants provide and manage network security products and services and employed Plaintiff until her termination on August 26, 2015.

- 2. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that Defendant is a corporation authorized to do business, employing individuals in and existing under the laws of the State of California with their principal place of business in San Mateo County at 500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood Shores, CA 94065.
- 3. The jurisdiction of this Court over the subject matter of this action is predicated on 28 United States Code section 1331. This is a civil action arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. The jurisdiction of this Court over the subject matter of this action is further predicated on 28 United States Code section 1367, as all claims in this matter form part of the same case or controversy.
- 4. Venue is proper in the Northern District because Defendants exist and operate in this district and Plaintiff resides in this district. Furthermore, all claims alleged herein arose in this District.
- 5. Under 28 United States Code section 1391(c), Defendants are subject to this Court's personal jurisdiction with respect to this civil action because Defendants are authorized to transact business within the County of San Mateo, State of California. Defendants conduct and have conducted day-to-day commercial activities within the County of San Mateo. Thus, Defendants have engaged in substantial, continuous, and systematic activities within the County of San Mateo, State of California, providing for a fair and reasonable basis for the exercise of personal jurisdiction over both Defendants by this Court in this venue.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

6. This action arises in San Mateo County as a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in San Mateo County.

PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a resident of the County of Santa Clara, California and was an employee of Defendants ORACLE AMERICA, INC. (hereinafter "Defendants" or "the company"). Defendants provide and manage network security products and services and employed Plaintiff until her termination on August 26, 2015.
- 8. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that Defendant is a corporation authorized to do business, employing individuals in and existing under the laws of the State of California with their principal place of business in San Mateo County at 500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood Shores, CA 94065.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. Plaintiff's tenure at ORACLE, where she worked as a Senior Finance Manager, North America SaaS/Cloud Revenue, came to an abrupt end because she resisted, refused to engage in and threatened to blow the whistle on accounting practices she reasonably believed to be unlawful. Upper management was trying (and trying to push her) to fit square data into round holes, in an effort to bolster ORACLE Cloud Services financial reports that would be paraded before company leadership as well as the investing public.
- 10. An experienced CPA, auditor and finance professional, Plaintiff was well aware of Sarbanes-Oxley controls and directives to adhere to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"). Mindful of these rules, Plaintiff diligently performed her duties and received a positive performance review in August 2015. The following month, however, her supervisors charted a course that veered from legal, ethical and company standards.
- 11. Plaintiff's superiors instructed her to add millions of dollars in accruals to financial reports, with no concrete or foreseeable billing to support the numbers, an act that Plaintiff warned was improper and suspect accounting. She told her supervisor, "I will blow the whistle" if ordered to proceed further in this fashion.

12. The data, she knew, would end up in SEC filings and be touted on earnings calls, used to paint a rosier picture than actually existed on the ground. Dollar amounts that might seem modest on their face would propagate through other data, influencing a host of statements on reports made to the investing public. Executives above her in the chain of command went ahead and added accruals on their own; once again, Plaintiff objected. She expressed serious misgivings about their plans for re-accruals as well. A supervisor instructed her to ignore the absent billings that she had pointed out, because his intention was to reaccrue. After confronting him about the dangers of a lack of billings, and the history of bad accruals that never resulted in billings, the supervisor told her that her statements were "irritating." In addition to supervisors, a fellow finance manager and the company's assistant controller were on notice of Plaintiff's concerns. As Plaintiff continued to resist and warn of the accounting improprieties, she became more of a roadblock than a team player who would blindly generate financial reports using improper bases in order to justify the bottom lines that her superiors demanded to see.

13. Within weeks, on October 15, 2015, the company terminated Plaintiff's employment.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (18 U.S.C. § 1514A et seq.) (Against all corporate Defendants)

- 14. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 15. Plaintiff is an employee, and Defendant is an employer, within the meaning of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1514A *et seq*.
- 16. Plaintiff engaged in activity that is legally protected under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act by reporting, resisting and refusing to engage in conduct that she reasonably believed violated or would violate the law and the Act's requirements.
- 17. Defendants' conduct following the above-described protected activity, which culminated in Plaintiff's termination, constitutes unlawful retaliation under the Act. Pursuant to

- 8 10
- 11 12

- 13
- 14
- 15 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20

2.1

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

- complaint under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act with the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration, notifying the agency of Act violations and the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiff thus will have complied with the Sarbanes-Oxley administrative exhaustion requirement as the Department of Labor did not issue a final decision on the complaint within 180 days of the filing of the administrative claim, without any fault of Plaintiff, thereby entitling Plaintiff to file this action in federal court.
- 18 As a proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer harm, including but not limited to, lost earnings and other employment benefits, loss of future employment benefits, including insurance and pension, loss of medical insurance, humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount to be proven at trial but exceeding the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 19. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, malice and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 20. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorneys' fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 21. Plaintiff requests relief as described below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (15

U.S.C. § 78u-6 et seq.)

(Against all corporate Defendants)

- 22. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 23. Plaintiff is an employee, and Defendant is an employer, within the meaning of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.
- 24. Plaintiff engaged in activity that is legally protected under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Specifically, 15 United States Code section 78u-

- 25. Defendants' conduct following the above-described protected activity, which culminated in Plaintiff's termination, constitutes unlawful retaliation under the Act.
- 26. As a proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer harm, including but not limited to, lost earnings and other employment benefits, loss of future employment benefits, including insurance and pension, loss of medical insurance, humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount to be proven at trial but exceeding the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 27. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, malice and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 28. Plaintiff has also incurred and continues to incur attorneys' fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 29. Plaintiff requests relief as described below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation (California Labor Code § 1102.5)

(Against all corporate Defendants)

- 30. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 31. Defendants terminated Plaintiff on October 15, 2015 following Plaintiff's protected activity under California Labor Code section 1102.5; Plaintiff's protected activity included complaints about, resistance to and refusal to engage in suspected violations of the law, including violations of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

32. As a proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer harm, including but not limited to, lost earnings and other employment benefits, loss of future employment benefits, including insurance and pension, loss of medical insurance, humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount to be proven at trial but exceeding the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.

- 33. In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, malice and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 34. Plaintiff requests relief as described below.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination In Violation Of Public Policy

(Against all corporate Defendants)

- 35. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates the same by reference as though fully set forth herein.
 - 36. Plaintiff was terminated on October 15, 2015.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, terminated Plaintiff because she engaged in protected activity under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and California Labor Code section 1102.5.
- 38. Plaintiff's termination was in violation of public policy as set forth in the above-cited statutes.
- 39. As a proximate result of Plaintiff's termination by Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer harm, including but not limited to, lost earnings and other employment benefits, loss of future employment benefits, including insurance and pension, loss of medical insurance, humiliation, emotional distress, and mental pain and anguish, all to her damage in an amount to be proven at trial but exceeding the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.

1	40.	In doing the acts herein alleged, Defendants acted with oppression, fraud, malice				
2	and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive					
3	damages in an amount according to proof at trial.					
4	41.	Plaintiff requests relief as described below.				
5		PRAYER FOR RELIEF				
6	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks relief from this Court in the following respects:					
7	1.	1. For special and general damages according to proof;				
8	2.	2. For punitive damages;				
9	3. For reinstatement or front pay in lieu thereof, according to proof;					
10	4. For double back pay on the second cause of action;					
11	5.	For a permanent injunction prohibiting Defer	ndants from retaliating against			
12	employees who raise concerns or complaints about (or refuse to engage in) conduct they					
13	reasonably believe to be unlawful or fraudulent under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act or the Dodd-					
14	Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act;					
15	6.	For costs of suit incurred herein;				
16	7.	For attorney fees on causes of action where fees are available by law;				
17	8.	For prejudgment and post-judgment interest as available by law; and				
18	9.	9. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.				
19						
20	Dated:	June 1, 2016	Respectfully submitted,			
21			The			
22			Daniel Velton			
23			Attorney for Plaintiff SVETLANA BLACKBURN			
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

Case 3:16-cv-02925-EDL Document 1 Filed 06/01/16 Page 13 of 13

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial for each cause of action on which she is entitled to a jury trial. Dated: June 1, 2016 Respectfully submitted, Attorney for Plaintiff
SVETLANA BLACKBURN